



1761

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Darin Trees )  
For: Therapeutic Exercise Device ) Conf. No. 6098  
Serial No.: 10/695,117 ) Art Unit: 3764  
Filed: October 28, 2003 ) Examiner: Lori Baker Amerson

AMENDMENT/RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

May 8, 2007

Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is a Response to an Office Action which was mailed on February 28, 2007 in connection with the application identified above, along with a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. §1.31. Also enclosed is a postcard receipt addressed to Applicant's attorney. Please file the Response, mark the postcard with the date of receipt and return it to the undersigned attorney. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David J. Hill  
Attorney for Applicant  
(Registration No. 28427)  
Chambliss, Bahner & Stophel, P.C.  
1000 Tallan Building  
Two Union Square  
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2500  
423/756-3000

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on May 8, 2007.

  
Donna Guy  
Date of Signature: May 8, 2007



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:	Darin Trees	)		
		)		
For:	Therapeutic Exercise Device	)	Conf. No.	6098
		)		
Serial No.:	10/695,117	)	Art Unit:	3764
		)		
Filed:	October 28, 2003	)	Examiner:	Lori Baker Amerson

AMENDMENT/RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

May 8, 2007

Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a response to the Office Action that was mailed on February 28, 2007. Claims 1, 3-9, 13-15 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,810,698 of Hullett et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,601,519 of Comereski. Claims 1, 4-8, 10 and 13-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,940,911 of Wang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,601,519 of Comereski. Claims 2, 11-12 and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,940,911 of Wang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,601,519 of Comereski and U.S. Patent No. 7,181,793 of Lee. Objection has been raised to claim 17 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicant has now amended claim 17 to incorporate therein the limitations of claim 1 from which it depends. In addition, Applicant has amended claim 19 to add a reference of dependency to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant offers the following remarks to address the rejections of his claims and respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of such remarks.